

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
Work Session
Tuesday, May 5, 2026
4:30 p.m.**

Mayor: Eric Jensen

Council Members: Cyd LeMone
Dustin Phillips
Steve Rogers
Todd Williams

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Wendy Thorpe, City Recorder
Denise Roy, Finance Director
David Packard, Human Resources Manager
Drew Engemann, Fire Chief
Keldon Brown, Police Chief
Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director
Deon Giles, Parks Director
Sheri Britsch, Library Director
Megan Zollinger, Recreation Director
Andi Veenker, Recreation Department
Soad Sing, Administration Intern

Excused: Sierra Pierson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Christine Petersen, City Attorney
Dianna Andersen, Council Member
Neal Winterton, Public Works Director

The City Council and Staff met in the Community Room, 108 South 100 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah.

4:30 P.M. WORK SESSION

Mayor Eric Jensen called the Work Session to order at 4:31 p.m. and welcomed those present. He reminded the Council that there would be RDA and LBA meetings after the regular City Council meeting.

a. Pool Hours Adjustment Discussion – Director Zollinger.

Special Events Coordinator, Andi Veenker, reported that a service project would be held on May 21, 2026, where volunteers would place 1,630 flags on veterans' headstones in honor of Memorial Day. The City Council, Staff, and members of the community were invited to participate. The Memorial Day service would be held on Monday, May 25, and she asked that anyone planning to attend send

an RSVP. Pleasant Grove Youth were participating in an essay contest for the event, and the Council would choose a winner from the top three.

Coordinator Veenker presented the City Council with a frame and collectible tiles for America250 that would be used to encourage attendance in City special events like Follow the Flag, Strawberry Days, Heritage Festival, Veterans' Day and Memorial Day services, and the July 4 celebration at Cook Family Park. Residents could purchase the empty frame for \$12 and collect a free tile at each event, and the full frame would be released on July 4. Magnetic backs were also available for purchase. To her knowledge, no other city in the nation had a similar promotion.

Recreation Director, Megan Zollinger, reported that the pool will open soon. Staff reviewed overall operational costs and identified a savings opportunity regarding pool hours. It currently closes at 8:00 p.m., and the proposal was to close at 7:00 p.m. Between 1% and 4% of daily attendance occurs in that hour, but staffing costs are \$425 per hour. The adjustment would save \$27,000 in wages. Additionally, in August, the pool typically opens in the afternoon after school lets out, but those hours also have very low attendance. She proposed that the opening be moved to the evening, which would create an additional \$36,000 in savings. This would also change evening rental opportunities to two- or three-hour blocks only beginning at 7:00 p.m. The changes would allow the City to offer competitive wages while also cutting costs and potentially increasing rental revenue.

In response to a question raised by Council Member Wilding, Director Zollinger confirmed that rentals will always begin at 7:00 p.m. Council Member Williams stated that rentals may actually increase because 7:00 p.m. is a better time.

Council Member LeMone stated that it was the first time pool hours had been analyzed since she had been on the Council, and she was in favor of the change. It would benefit both the City and its employees.

Council Member Phillips asked how the 1% to 4% number was calculated and how many of those visitors had purchased a membership or arrived earlier and may be disappointed in being asked to leave at 7:00 p.m. Director Zollinger reported that Assistant Recreation Director, Shawn Whitaker, initially proposed the change and had run the numbers, and she would follow up with him regarding that question. However, the system only tracks when people arrive, not when they leave. They anticipated that a small number of people would be upset by the change, but it could be reevaluated if issues arose.

Council Member Williams asked for information on the number of people who arrive between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. Mayor Jensen asked Director Zollinger to send the information to City Administrator, Scott Darrington, who would forward it to the City Council.

Council Member LeMone agreed that the hours could be adjusted if necessary and asked if the potential change could be advertised to provide residents with time to give feedback. Director Zollinger stated that it was already on the website, and they would also inform the public via social media. She would also follow up with specific numbers.

b. Budget Discussion.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the Truth-in-Taxation process.

- Property taxes in Utah are revenue-driven.
- Valuation increases do not result in higher taxes.
- Increases and decreases usually result in tax burden shifts.
- There is a natural downward bias in property taxes because inflation is purposely backed out. For cities to compensate for inflation, they must declare a tax increase.
- Primary residential properties receive a 45% tax break. Commercial properties are not eligible for an exemption.
- Most of the above facts were unlikely to change, as Truth-in-Taxation had been in effect for over 40 years.
- This process is fundamental to understanding public budgets in Utah.
- Despite all of the above, property tax is the most stable revenue source for local governments and is the tax over which local officials have the most control. The State controls the sales tax rate, but the City Council controls the property tax rate.

The baseline property tax rate is received each year by June 1. The rate either increases or decreases based on the assessed valuation of the City in aggregate. The value typically increases yearly, and as a result, the tax rate is reduced. If the value decreases, the rate increases. The amount of property tax revenue is constant regardless of changes in property value unless the Council chooses to increase taxes to receive more revenue, which requires a Truth-in-Taxation notice and public hearing. The only exception is new growth, which is authorized by the County and State. Pleasant Grove City had one tax increase in 2022 and any other increases to revenue are due to new growth. Growth had slowed and would eventually become a non-factor in the City.

Administrator Darrington reviewed an illustration of how the property tax rate works. The example showed 10 homes, each with a market value of \$181,000. After the 45% homestead exemption, each home will only pay taxes on \$100,000 of value. At a 1% tax rate, each property owner will pay \$1,000 in property tax, or \$10,000 total for the 10 homes.

In year two, the values double. The total tax value for all homes increases to \$200,000, but the tax rate is reduced to 0.5% to keep revenue neutral and the City still receives \$10,000.

In year three, different homes have different values. Individual home values may vary, but the City receives the same amount of revenue. In this example, the total value for all homes is \$2.27 million, \$1.225 million of which is taxable. The tax rate changes to 0.82%, and the City still receives \$10,000. In year four, new growth in the City brings in an additional \$1,200.

Pleasant Grove had only changed its tax rate once in the past 30 to 40 years. Property tax bills had increased due to other taxing entities. For example, Alpine School District had consistent increases because they did not receive sales tax revenue.

Administrator Darrington stated that purchasing power is lost over time if the tax rate is not changed. In his opinion, Truth-in-Taxation was created to make it difficult for cities to increase their property

tax rates, and it had worked. The public is very involved in the process, and cities are hesitant to go through the process so instead rely on sales tax or other revenue sources. However, sales tax growth had stabilized over the past two years, and many cities were holding Truth-in-Taxation hearings this year.

The Truth-in-Taxation process was implemented to ensure that residents know that the City Council is considering a property tax increase. Notice must now be provided at the first meeting in May. Previously, notice was provided in June after the certified tax rate was received from the county. Public feedback indicated that that was too late in the process, and in response the legislature now required earlier notice. The Business Session agenda included two discussion items and four resolutions related to the tax increase. The process was new, and Staff wanted to ensure that all bases were covered. If the City Council was considering a tax increase, they would need to pass all four resolutions. If they did not want to consider the tax increase, they could vote “no” and the matter would be concluded for the year.

Administrator Darrington reported that the City is required by law to adopt a Tentative Budget at its first May meeting, and the budget must include any contemplated tax increase. Council Member Rogers stated that his understanding of the new law was that the City must have a contingency plan. The Tentative Budget is passed with a property tax increase, but there is an understanding that if the property tax does not pass, a different budget will be available. Administrator Darrington stated that any time that the City Council discussed the budget between that meeting and its final adoption, a Property Tax Impact Statement must be read. When the Interim Budget is adopted in June, all items associated with the tax increase are pulled out of the budget and placed into an expense account. If the City Council decides against the tax increase, that account does not become part of the budget.

In the past, a budget would not be adopted until after the Truth-in-Taxation hearing, but that caused issues because cities essentially began spending the money prior to the hearing. Now, all items associated with the tax increase must be moved into the expense account, and the City must specifically state how the money will be spent. Staff had been clear about their requests, and the proposed Property Tax Impact Statement would include that information. The statement would be read by Finance Director, Denise Roy.

A resolution was also required to set the public Truth-in-Taxation hearing date of August 11, 2026. The hearing cannot be held on the same date as any other taxing entity on residents’ bills, including Alpine School District, Utah County, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, and North Utah Water Conservancy District. The Alpine School District hearing was scheduled for August 4, and most cities in Utah County were considering August 11. The resolution would set the date for Pleasant Grove.

Administrator Darrington indicated that it was the beginning of the process. If the City Council approved the resolutions, they would be stating that they will consider a tax increase. The next step was to educate the public on their intentions. The Council could halt the process at any time up to and including August 11. Residents were under the impression that the tax increase would be enacted at that meeting, but by law the earliest it could be enacted was August 11. He asked that the City Council adopt the resolutions so the process could begin.

Council Member Rogers asked if the Property Tax Impact Statement could be changed after adoption, as he was leery of the number and would be opposed to passing it if the rate could not be lowered. Administrator Darrington believes that the tax rate can be reduced but not increased. To his understanding, the City Council could reduce the amount up to and including August 11. Council Member LeMone wanted to hold the Truth-in-Taxation hearing with the most appealing number possible, not the highest number proposed. Administrator Darrington clarified that the Impact Statement could be changed to that effect.

Council Member Rogers stated that August 11 is not the only date the City Council can receive public input, and he wanted to solicit input throughout the entire three-month period. Administrator Darrington remarked that the legislative changes were made because the State wants there to be a three-month dialogue. Once the intention is made known, the Council can then engage with the public through surveys, open houses, etc. The idea is to educate residents and answer their questions. Council Member Rogers stated that all available forms of communication should be used, including adding a notice to water bills and having a link on the website for comments. He asked to discuss the matter further after hearing from residents in the Open Session.

It was noted that City Attorney, Christine Petersen, was not present but could review the law and get back to the Council regarding future changes to the Property Tax Impact Statement. Administrator Darrington stated that prior to the latest legislative changes, the City had the ability to reduce the proposed tax increase but not increase it. If a tax increase is included in the adopted budget on June 22, Utah County will be notified, and property tax notices mailed in July will include the new rate. The notice will also include the date, time, and location of the Truth-in-Taxation hearing. Dialogue with residents would continue during that time to ensure that the public knows why the increase is necessary. They may decide that an additional \$4 per month is worth it to have an increased public safety presence. He noted that anyone speaking to the item in the Regular Meeting may not have that information or be aware of the new process.

In response to a question raised by Council Member Phillips, Administrator Darrington clarified that the tax increase would be \$4 per month on a primary residence with an average value of \$570,655. Director Roy clarified that it was based on 2025 averages as the 2026 numbers had not been released. Administrator Darrington noted that a home assessed at \$800,000 would pay slightly more, and a home assessed at \$300,000 would pay slightly less.

Council Member Rogers stated that the City Council wants the public to be fully informed and is committed to being overly cautious with compliance. Administrator Darrington agreed and noted that the agenda was more robust than many cities. If the Council adopted the resolutions, it could then discuss how the information should be disseminated to the public. Flyers, social media, and open houses had been utilized in the past, although most residents may not be aware of the increase until they receive their tax notice in July. He liked the idea of a survey, and some companies specialize in creating non-biased surveys that also educate the public. Council Member Rogers stated that the point of paying for a third-party survey is to understand residents' actual opinions on the proposed tax increase. Administrator Darrington stated that when the last tax increase was proposed, he believes the City did a good job of reaching out to residents, and a lot of public input was received.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the Truth-in-Taxation timeline.

- June 1: Notify Utah County and the State Auditor of the City's intentions and public hearing date.
- June 2: Public hearing on the proposed budget, including the Property Tax Impact Statement.
- June 22: Adoption of the intended rate, as well as the Interim Budget including the property tax increase. The Property Tax Impact Statement will also be read.

Administrator Darrington stated that it can be frustrating to discuss a property tax increase amount and valuations when the County does not provide that information until June 1. He assumed that the assessed home value would increase. Once that information was received, calculations would be completed to determine the actual proposed rate.

Administrator Darrington conducted an informal survey of other city managers to determine how many other cities were considering a property tax increase. Of the 57 cities that responded, 27 were considering a property tax increase, and 17 indicated that at least a portion of the increase was for public safety. Cities in Utah County that were considering an increase included Saratoga Springs, Santaquin, Orem, Cedar Hills, American Fork, Springville, and Eagle Mountain. Lehi was uncertain. Increases specifically to fund public safety were contemplated by Saratoga Springs, Orem, Cedar Hills, American Fork, and Eagle Mountain. Portions of proposed increases in Santaquin, Springville, and Lehi would go to public safety. Cities that were not considering an increase included Payson, Alpine, Lindon, Mapleton, Spanish Fork, and Provo. Most cities were experiencing the same issues as Pleasant Grove.

Council Member Williams asked how sales tax could be leveling off. Administrator Darrington reported that by "leveling", he means that sales tax revenues are lower than in the past. The City had seen yearly sales tax revenue increases of 8% or higher, but only a 3.9% increase was budgeted for the next fiscal year. The marginal rate was decreasing, so it was a lesser increase than in previous years. Council Member Williams stated that the rate of increase had flattened, but total revenue had increased. Administrator Darrington reported that the smaller increase will be used to fund salary increases, make one employee full-time, and compensate for transferring money from the capital budget for operational needs. In the past, an 8% increase would generate approximately \$600,000 in additional revenue.

Council Member Rogers asked about the methodology behind that calculation. Administrator Darrington stated that the City receives a monthly report with the rolling percentage difference in sales tax revenues over the past 12 months, and the last update showed 4%. The last reported month was slightly higher, but there are no wide fluctuations month to month. Staff reviews the revenues over the past year, as well as state and national trends.

Administrator Darrington prefers a conservative approach. They could potentially change the estimate to 6%, but he cautioned against that type of aggressive budgeting as it could cause the City to use reserve funds to cover any shortage. His goal was to ensure that reserves do not need to be used and any excess revenue can roll over into the next year. He understood that some people may prefer a more aggressive approach, but his goal was to preserve the City's long-term financial viability. If the City Council wanted to change that estimate, he would like to discuss potential consequences to ensure that there is a full understanding of worst-case outcomes. The reserve account had a balance of \$4 million, which is not a lot of money. The City used its rainy day funds in 2010 because sales taxes decreased significantly, resulting in a \$500,000 deficit. Six people were also laid

off. Those hard decisions were necessary to balance the budget. Another nationwide recession would necessitate a very different conversation.

Council Member LeMone asked why Staff assumed that sales tax revenue would decrease with all the new businesses that have and continue to come into the City. Council Member Williams clarified that revenue is not decreasing; the rate of growth is flattening. Council Member LeMone stated that the Council must be careful in explaining it to the public, as she wants citizens to know how hard they worked to bring businesses in and increase sales tax revenues so as not place a burden on residents. If the City had budgeted conservatively for 20 years, it might be time to think more aggressively. Residents were being asked to pay higher utility rates, fund Cook Family Park, pay a property tax increase, etc., and she would rather be aggressive with the budget so that a tax increase is the last resort. She believes that residents will look at the number of new businesses in The Grove and wonder why they are being asked for more money.

Administrator Darrington clarified that sales tax revenue does not cover the City's additional needs. Council Member LeMone suggested staggering the needs or not funding all requests so that the public does not need to be asked for a tax increase. People had been laid off and were dealing with inflation and a poor economy. The school district was enacting an increase. She was not comfortable with a 16.55% increase but may be comfortable with a 3% to 5% increase. Administrator Darrington stated that if the City Council determines that the increase will not be funded, it will not be funded. A lesser amount will mean that fewer firefighters and police officers are hired. Mayor Jensen stated that the discussion was part of the process.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the sales tax formula. All sales tax revenues are received by the state, and they forward 50% of point-of-sale revenues directly to the City. The other 50% is distributed by population. Pleasant Grove's population as a percentage of the state would continue to decrease, and as a result a larger portion of revenues from new businesses in the City would not generate that revenue. If new businesses were not opening, the required property tax increase could be \$15 per month. The State had indicated that growth would be 4%. He did not recommend budgeting for a more aggressive percentage, but would do so at the Council's direction.

Mayor Jensen stated that Administrator Darrington would speak more to the issue during the Business Meeting.

c. Staff Business

There was no staff business.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: At 5:36 p.m., Council Member Williams moved to ADJOURN the Work Session. Council Member Rogers seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Rogers, Phillips, LeMone, and Williams voting "Yes."

The City Council Work Session Minutes of May 5, 2026, were approved by the City Council on June 2, 2026.

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
Regular Session
Tuesday, May 5, 2026
6:00 p.m.**

Mayor: Eric Jensen

Council Members: Cyd LeMone
Dustin Phillips
Steve Rogers
Todd Williams

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Wendy Thorpe, City Recorder
Denise Roy, Finance Director
David Packard, Human Resources Manager
Drew Engemann, Fire Chief
Keldon Brown, Police Chief
Megan Zollinger, Recreation Director
Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director
Soad Sing, Intern
Deon Giles, Parks Director
Sheri Britsch, Library Director

Excused: Sierra Pierson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Dianna Andersen, Council Member
Neal Winterton, Public Works Director

The City Council and Staff met in the Community Room, 108 South 100 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah.

6:00 P.M. REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

1) CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Eric Jensen called the Regular Session to order at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Human Resources Manager, David Packard.

3) OPENING REMARKS

The Opening remarks were offered by Council Member Phillips.

4) APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Mayor Jensen reported that presentations would be heard next, followed by a statement from City Administrator, Scott Darrington.

ACTION: Council Member Phillips moved to APPROVE the Meeting Agenda, with changes. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Rogers, Phillips, LeMone, and Williams voting “Yes.”

Council Member LeMone left the meeting at 6:19 p.m.

After presentations, Administrator Darrington provided a recap of the Work Session discussion and reported that the evening’s agenda included two discussion items and four resolutions. No public hearings were scheduled, but citizens could speak during the Open Session.

Truth-in-Taxation requires the City Council to complete certain steps if a property tax increase is contemplated, including reading of two statements. Finance Director, Denise Roy, would present the Property Tax Impact Statement, which details the proposed tax increase, how much revenue it will generate, the impact on the overall tax bill, and how the additional money will be spent. The City Council would also consider resolutions on the Truth-in-Taxation hearing date and discuss the Tentative Budget.

Administrator Darrington reported that the City was required to include revenue generated by a potential tax increase in the Tentative Budget. When the Interim Budget was adopted on June 22, line items associated with the increase would be pulled into a separate expense account and only be activated if the City Council adopted the proposed property tax rate in August.

Council Member LeMone returned at 6:24 p.m.

The budget timeline was as follows:

- June 2: Public hearing on proposed Budget
- June 22: Adoption of the certified tax rate, and adoption of the Interim Budget with increased property tax held in a restricted account

Administrator Darrington reported that the City Council was not adopting a property tax increase at the meeting. The soonest an increase could be adopted would be on August 11.

Sales taxes were discussed in the Work Session. Revenues are distributed in a 50-50 split based on point-of-sale and population, and sales tax is dependent on the economy. The City had not seen a decrease in sales tax revenues since 2010. Administrator Darrington had made the statement that sales tax revenue was flattening or leveling, meaning that the growth rate had slowed, but actual revenues continued to increase. The growth rate had been slightly higher than 4%, and Staff recommended that the 4% rate be used for the budget. Higher rates had been recommended in the past when the economy was better or specific businesses were expected to open, but growth was slowing.

Administrator Darrington had been a City Manager for 26 years, and his budgeting philosophy was a conservative one. He and Director Roy discuss estimated property and sales tax revenues before addressing expenses, and his goal was for each year to end with a surplus. To accomplish that goal, they are conservative with revenue estimates. The projected sales tax growth of 4% was in line with the past 12 months. If the economy remained steady, the City would meet that revenue goal. Some new businesses would be opening and add revenue to the City, and any surplus would carry forward as capital for the following year. In his opinion, this was a solid budgeting approach. Pleasant Grove was one of only seven cities in Utah to receive the Triple Crown Public Finance Award, which would not be possible if the City did not budget responsibly, meet its obligations, and generate revenue and spend appropriately. This is why a yearly property tax increase is not necessary.

Some cities have a yearly cost-of-living tax increase of 3% to 4%. Pleasant Grove had not adopted that philosophy. The last tax increase was in 2022, and a proposed 2023 increase was referred by residents and voted down. No other tax increases has been enacted in the City's history as sales tax revenue had historically covered expenses. However, as Pleasant Grove becomes built out, revenue growth will decrease. Some expenses will also level out, but items like cost-of-living and benefits increases for employees will continue to rise. The City is a service industry, with 75% of expenses being related to personnel, so drastic reductions in expenses must come from personnel costs. For example, in 2011, six employees were laid off in order to balance the budget.

At the end of the last fiscal year, the City had a \$1 million surplus to be applied to one-time needs. The surplus had decreased each year except during COVID-19 when federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security ("CARES") Act and America Rescue Plan Act ("ARPA") funds were received. The budgeting process begins by using previous-year actuals, as well as 2026 year-to-date numbers. However, complete financials were only available for the first seven months and sales tax revenues are received two months in arrears. Transfers out of the General Fund occur in June, and substantial transfers are required. Staff projected a surplus of approximately \$500,000 for the current fiscal year.

Administrator Darrington cautioned against using one-time revenues to cover operational expenses as the expenses would still be present in the next fiscal year but have no associated revenue source. If one-time monies were used to cover the \$683,000 budget shortfall in FY2026-2027, the \$683,000 would also need to be covered in future years and the City may have to dip into its reserved, lay off employees, or take other measures to balance the budget. If it is used for operational expenses, the City will also eventually run out of one-time money and some one-time capital expenses like purchasing a new ambulance would need to be delayed.

The same budgeting philosophy had been employed by Administrator Darrington and Director Roy in all their years with the City. The difference was that this year, they were asking for a tax increase. It was appropriate for there to be additional scrutiny from the City Council and public; Staff works for the Council, which is elected by the public. It was their job to make proposals that they believe are in the best interests of the City, and it was the Council's job to make hard decisions that may not be popular or easy.

Administrator Darrington reported that as property values increase, the property tax rate decreases. The City's tax rate was below .001% for the first time in his recollection. The 2022 property tax increase resulted in very little additional income due to a rate decrease, which is not uncommon.

Some cities have a policy of retaining the same rate. In response to a question raised by Council Member LeMone, Administrator Darrington stated that the 2022 tax increase did not fully hold the previous rate as the City Council believed that the required \$7 per month increase was too high.

A comparison chart of full-time firefighters per 1,000 population was reviewed. Administrator Darrington reported that the City only had one station, which was a benefit from an economies-of-scale perspective. Response times to northern Pleasant Grove were longer but still within standard. A second station would increase response times but be significantly more expensive. All comparison cities had more than one station.

Pleasant Grove ideally has seven firefighters on each shift, including five full-time and two part-time employees. Due to staffing shortages, sometimes a shift only has five or six firefighters. There were a total of 348 partially staffed or open shifts in 2025, an increase of 115% since 2021. Stacked calls, when two or more calls are received at one time, require help from other cities, primarily American Fork. If this happens, the other city receives the associated revenue.

Council Member Williams asked about the percentage of full-time firefighters per 1,000 residents in other cities with only one station. Administrator Darrington stated that only neighboring cities were sampled, and Pleasant Grove is one of the few with only one station. Council Member Williams stated that it was difficult to understand what the percentage should be, as cities with two stations naturally have a higher percentage. Administrator Darrington reported that the national standard is one firefighter per 1,000 population, and Pleasant Grove had 0.40 per 1,000.

Council Member Phillips stated that there is a cost advantage to having only one station because there is only one set of fixed costs. Administrator Darrington agreed that the City should keep one station, but the goal was to increase staffing to six full-time firefighters per shift in the next budget year and eventually seven.

Fire Chief, Drew Engemann, reported that the City keeps two ambulances and one engine in service, and an ambulance and engine respond to calls. If another call for service is received, American Fork or Orem responds because two people in one ambulance cannot respond on their own. If the engine can clear from the first call, Pleasant Grove will respond. The previous Saturday, he had to request assistance from American Fork three times within two hours.

Council Member Rogers asked how the funding increase would change operations. Chief Engemann stated that it would require nine employees on two engines and two ambulances to cover all calls, and he understood that that was not realistic. One extra person per shift would increase the odds that each shift would be fully staffed with seven firefighters rather than five or six. Sixty shifts per month must be filled by part-time staff, and there were currently only 26 part-time employees. Full-time employees frequently had to work overtime to maintain staffing levels and were averaging 80 hours per week with overtime.

Council Member Rogers asked which statistics would be materially affected by increased funding. He did not believe the number of firefighters per 1,000 population would change significantly, but the number of open shifts should decrease. Chief Engemann stated that it would increase the level of service. There were 2,243 calls in 2025, and an extra firefighter would increase the likelihood of

having seven firefighters per shift. Part-time staff can be difficult as they may not have the same level of commitment. One firefighter may not make a major difference, but it would help.

Council Member Phillips remarked that full-time firefighters have a stronger level of commitment and ownership. Chief Engemann agreed and noted that it costs approximately \$8,000 to outfit a new firefighter. If a part-time employee leaves and the City does not have the correct gear, new gear must be purchased. It is difficult and expensive to rotate and maintain equipment for 30 part-time firefighters.

Administrator Darrington reviewed current Police Department conditions and noted that a narrative would be added to the chart to better explain the department's needs. The City has 0.79 sworn officers per 1,000 population, and the standard is one per 1,000. Drug offenses had decreased, but the City was dealing with serious drug issues and needed to ensure that the Police Department was adequately staffed. More and more requests were being received to monitor crosswalks, speeding, and other issues that require officer time. There were only three officers on shift, so one could not be dedicated to traffic or crosswalks. The requested two new officers would not alleviate all issues and concerns. The property tax increase would also fund one additional officer through the City's reserve program, which brings in experienced officers from other cities as supplementary staff. Those officers are paid an hourly rate but are ineligible for benefits or retirement contributions.

In response to a question raised by Council Member Williams, Administrator Darrington reported that there was currently one open full-time Police position and Fire was fully staffed. Police Chief, Keldon Brown, reported that the City had lost two officers in the past month, one to retirement and the other to Draper, and one new officer had been hired. Inexperienced new hires must go through three months of training at the academy and another three months with a field training officer, and it takes approximately three years to be fully trained. There was currently one new hire in the academy who would complete that training on June 11. He hoped to bring on three to four new reserve officers to meet staffing needs for Strawberry Days, but reserve officers are easier to hire and do not have as great an impact on the budget.

Council Member Williams asked for more information on why the Police Department was under budget from August through January. Director Roy reported that 58% of the current-year budget was reflected in the most recent document. Job openings can affect the calculations, as can overtime and other costs of being understaffed. There is also a lag in expenses, and health insurance is budgeted for family coverage but some employees are single. Council Member Williams stated that his calculation was an underspend of \$600,000 in the current fiscal year. Chief Brown reported that the department was only fully staffed for two weeks of the year and provided information on open positions.

In response to a follow-up question from Council Member Williams, Administrator Darrington confirmed that any surplus is rolled over for capital expenses if it is not needed to cover other budget shortfalls in the Police Department. Director Roy discusses operational needs with each department head toward the end of each fiscal year and makes any necessary adjustments, and a final Budget Amendment is typically presented to the City Council in June. For example, building permit revenue is typically over budget, but that revenue is not rolled over into operations because you cannot predict the number of permits that will be issued the following year. The overage rolls into capital projects. A nearby city that budgeted building permit revenues for operational expenses had to enact a very

large property tax increase and lay off employees in 2008 when the housing market crashed. Another crash was not anticipated, but the City was hedging against it.

Council Member Williams asked about the Charges for Services line item. Director Roy reported that the three largest charges for services are plan check, ambulance, and development inspection fees.

In response to a question raised by Mayor Jensen, Administrator Darrington reported that the property tax increase would fund three firefighters, two police officers, reserves, and salary increases to retain public safety employees.

5) OPEN SESSION

Mayor Jensen opened the Open Session.

Bob Scott commended the City Council for its robust discussion on the potential property tax increase, which should be a last resort. In speaking about the Grove, last year Council Member Williams stated that over \$1 billion was invested, thousands of new jobs were created, and millions in new tax revenue was generated without increasing taxes for residents. It was projected that the Grove would generate an additional \$2 million in tax revenue, 10,000 new jobs, and have 6,000 square feet of sales-tax-generating space. To his knowledge, no data had been provided on what was generated or how that money was used. In 2023, the City Council asked for a property tax increase to hire additional fire and police. It was a matter of public safety, as it was now. The property tax increase was voted down, but the personnel were still hired. He asked that the Council consider other sources of revenue to hire the new public safety employees. If the entire surplus could not be used, perhaps a portion of it could be used in addition to a smaller property tax increase. There were other ways to bring in \$683,000.

John Johannes Meyer expressed concern about how the City budgets. Keeping good police and fire employees is important, and he believes those items should be taken out first. He cares about the lives of people in Pleasant Grove. If the City did not have enough money for low-priority items, they should say so, but they should not make it about fire and police as he did not believe that was the right thing to do. The City should prioritize things that are lifesaving and residents should not be asked to give more for those things. If the City wants a new retention pond, they should ask. He asked that the surplus be used instead of enacting a property tax increase as residents are bombarded with increases from the county and schools. He is on a fixed income, and taxes are a sensitive subject.

Joseph West commented that he is not an expert in budgeting, but he complimented Administrator Darrington on his position that the City should not spend money it cannot count on next year. He believes that it is a very good approach.

There were no further comments. The Open Session was closed.

6) CONSENT ITEMS

- A. **To Consider for Approval Payment No. 12 to FX Construction for the American Fork River Diversion Reconstruction Project.**

- B. To Consider for Approval Payment No. 2 to Condie Construction Co., LLC for the 800 North Area Waterline, Drainage and Roadway Reconstruction Project.**
- C. To Consider for Approval Change Order No. 1 for Condie Construction Co., LLC for the 800 North Area Waterline, Drainage and Roadway Reconstruction Project.**
- D. To Consider for Approval Payment No. 21 to HydroVac Excavation for the Pressurized Irrigation Meters Installation Project.**
- E. Payment Approval Reports for April 30, 2026.**

ACTION: Council Member Rogers moved to APPROVE the Consent Items, as presented. Council Member Williams seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Rogers, Phillips, LeMone, and Williams voting “Yes.”

7) BOARD, COMMISSION, AND COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS:

There were no appointments.

8) PRESENTATIONS

These items were heard prior to Item 5.

A. JustServe City Certificate Presentation.

Tom Fox introduced his wife, Jane, as well as Stephen and Dana, who represent JustServe.org. They met with Mayor Jensen to discuss Pleasant Grove becoming a JustServe city. The City Council passed a proclamation to that effect, and Mr. Fox was in attendance to present Pleasant Grove with a certificate confirming Pleasant Grove’s status as a JustServe city. That information could be posted on the website. Yard signs, stickers, and handouts were also available. Participating in JustServe shows the City’s great heritage of volunteerism. Mr. Fox would work with Staff to make Pleasant Grove a JustServe organization so volunteer opportunities could come directly from the City. In response to a question raised by Council Member Phillips, Mr. Fox clarified that organizations can post their own projects, but any other volunteer projects must be approved prior to posting.

Dana Fox stated that the next step was for Pleasant Grove to become a JustServe Global City. To do so, the City would need to recognize some of its volunteer heroes for their amazing service. JustServe has a commemorative coin that can be presented to those deserving volunteers, after which Pleasant Grove could be nominated as a JustServe Global City.

Council Member LeMone asked how the Foxes became involved in JustServe. Ms. Fox stated that they were called from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. JustServe is a resource put out by the Church, but anyone can use it. Mr. Fox stated that they work with all faiths, including the First Baptist Church of Pleasant Grove, as well as local nonprofits.

Mr. Dailey stated that he and Ms. Dailey serve on the Church Communication Council. They work with JustServe and interfaith groups in northern Utah County. Mayor Jensen is part of an interfaith council that meets quarterly and is a great opportunity to find ways to serve together. Pleasant Grove, Lehi, Lindon, and American Fork are all JustServe cities.

Photographs were taken with the City Council.

B. Award Recognition for Pleasant Grove Library.

Mayor Jensen read from the letter of recognition. “The Utah State Library would like to recognize Pleasant Grove Public Library for outstanding service to their community during 2025. Please accept our congratulations on earning the Quality Library Award. The Quality Library Award is a designation that the State Library determines during recertification, which is an annual process that requires public libraries to submit reports and data to indicate that their services are in accordance with State Library standards.” Mayor Jensen invited Library Director, Sherri Britsch, and her staff to the podium.

Director Britsch stated that she sometimes visits other libraries for inspiration. She visited a library in northern Utah and asked four employees what their library was known for. None had an answer, although one offered that their HVAC system does not work well, and one stated that they were “pretty good at programming”. She then asked Pleasant Grove Public Library employees to name something they were proud of.

Valerie Jensen stated that the library is a great place to work. She and her partner, Stephanie, are responsible for Toddler Storytime and Summer Reading, as well as the 1,000 Book Celebration. The best thing about the library is the people she meets, especially the families and children.

Amber Ard stated that the best thing about the library is the people, both its patrons and staff. It is a very welcoming community.

Rachel Louisiana was most proud of the programs the library offers.

Emery Gray was most proud of what the library has to offer people. Everyone can find something at the library, whether it is a program or something to take home.

Linda Butler loves that the library is truly the heart of the community. She had lived in Pleasant Grove for over 30 years, and for the first few months, the library was in a small house across the street from its current location. The library now has great books, people, and programs, as well as unique things that other libraries do not have. She runs the Literacy Center, which provides volunteer one-on-one tutoring to children in the community and really makes a difference in their lives. They do not just feed people’s minds; they have shelves outside that feed their bellies, too. Director Britsch is very supportive of employees finding needs and filling them, and the library helps the community in many ways. In response to a question from Mayor Jensen, Ms. Butler reported that the literacy program had been the best in Utah County for at least five years in a row.

Council Member LeMone stated that the library’s strengths are its programming because there is something for everyone, tutoring, and innovation. The library is always packed because of those things.

Mayor Jensen visited the library on May 4 and stated that it was decked out for Star Wars Day.

Council Member Phillips stated that the pet guinea pig is his favorite thing about the library.

Council Member Rogers loves how much his daughter loves to visit the library and check out books. The library is very welcoming, and they have wonderful resources.

Council Member Williams stated that his wife is an educator who served on the library board. She brings him to the library every two to three weeks to see the new books.

Director Britsch displayed the award, which reads, “Above and beyond: Awarded to Pleasant Grove Library for meeting and exceeding the highest standards. You’ve surpassed expectations and reached for the stars. Thank you for your remarkable performance.” To qualify for the award, libraries must reach beyond their physical space and hold events in other venues; meet or exceed the 70th percentile in library visits, checkout rate, programming opportunities, staffing levels, and internet terminal usage; offer an online experience with responsive web design; be responsive to requests; encourage staff development; offer engaging programming; and collaborate with other libraries. Director Britsch stated that the library staff made it easy to meet those requirements.

Photographs were taken with the City Council.

Administrator Darrington stated that his daughter worked in the Literacy Center with Ms. Butler, and the experience helped her learn about service and that there are teenagers who have never learned how to read.

9) DISCUSSION

A. Budget Officer Intent to State that the Tentative Budget includes a Proposed Property Tax Rate Increase. Presenter: Director Roy.

Administrator Darrington read the following statement into the record:

Budget Officer Intent to State that the Tentative Budget Includes a Proposed Property Tax Increase.

During the 2026 Utah Legislative Session, HB 236 – Truth-in-Taxation Amendments was enacted, making several changes to Utah Code §§ 59-2-919 and 59-2-924, which govern notice, disclosure, and public hearing requirements when a tentative budget includes a proposed property tax rate increase, including municipal property tax increases. These provisions are intended to promote transparency and ensure the public is provided clear information regarding the potential impacts of a proposed tax rate prior to final budget and tax rate adoption.

Among other changes, the amendments clarify requirements for fiscal-year taxing entities regarding the initial public presentation of the tentative budget. Specifically, the statute requires that, at the public meeting where the tentative budget is first presented, the budget officer must state whether the tentative budget includes a proposed property tax rate increase and present the associated property tax impact schedule. In addition, the meeting agenda must include a separate item notifying the

public that the budget officer intends to make this statement. This agenda item is included to comply with Utah Code § 59-2-919(4)(a)(ii) by providing notice of the budget officer's intent to state that the tentative budget includes a proposed property tax rate increase, thereby ensuring transparency and public awareness consistent with Truth-in-Taxation requirements.

B. Budget Officer Statement that the Tentative Budget Includes a Proposed Property Tax Rate Increase. Presenter: Director Roy.

Administrator Darrington read the following statement into the record:

Budget Officer Statement that the Tentative Budget includes a Proposed Property Tax Rate Increase.

During the 2026 Utah Legislative Session, HB 236 – Truth-in-Taxation Amendments was enacted, making several changes to Utah Code §§ 59-2-919 and 59-2-924, which govern notice, disclosure, and public hearing requirements when a tentative budget includes a proposed property tax rate increase, including municipal property tax increases. These provisions are intended to promote transparency and ensure the public is provided clear information regarding the potential impacts of a proposed tax rate prior to final budget and tax rate adoption.

Among other changes, the amendments clarify requirements for fiscal-year taxing entities regarding the initial public presentation of the tentative budget. Specifically, the statute requires that, at the public meeting where the tentative budget is first presented, the budget officer must state whether the tentative budget includes a proposed property tax rate increase and present the associated property tax impact schedule.

The agenda item was included to comply with Utah Code § 59-2-919(4)(a)(i) by providing notice and an official statement by the Budget Officer that the tentative budget includes a proposed property tax rate increase. Additional details regarding the proposed property tax rate increase will be presented during the formal presentation and adoption of the FY2027 Pleasant Grove City Tentative Budget and the Property Tax Impact Schedule.

10) ACTION ITEMS READY FOR VOTE

A. To Consider Resolution (2026-21) Adopting a Tentative Budget for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027, with a Property Tax Increase, and providing an Effective Date. Presenter: Director Roy.

Director Roy presented copies of the FY2026-2027 Tentative Budget, which includes revenues and expenses representing a property tax increase for Pleasant Grove City. The Executive Summary on page 3 of the document provides general information, and page 4 is a consolidated budget showing the estimated ending Fund balances for 2026, the new budget, and the estimated 2027 year-end Fund balances.

In response to a question raised by Council Member Williams, Director Roy reported that the Intergovernmental Revenue line item is for any revenue received from another governmental agency. She did not know the exact amount that had been received over the past three years, but it was higher than usual due to State monies received for the secondary metering project. Most intergovernmental revenue in the General Fund is from reimbursements for the liquor grant, Utah County grants, the CARES grant, and wildland firefighting. Council Member Williams noted that current revenue was 250% over budget, and the number had not increased for 2027. Director Roy reported that the only guaranteed grants for 2027 are the victim advocate grant of approximately \$35,000 and the liquor grant of approximately \$40,000. Some funds would also be received from Utah County, but the amount was unknown. The intergovernmental revenue budget was not increased because no other funds were guaranteed. A \$10 million federal National Resources Conservation Service (“NRCS”) grant was received in the Water Fund for a weir project, but those types of grants are project-dependent.

Council Member Williams asked for more information on the Miscellaneous Revenue line item, as \$564,000 was budgeted but \$714,000 had been received to date. Director Roy reported that she would have to research that item. Mayor Jensen asked if Council Member Williams would like to do a line-by-line review of the Tentative Budget. Council Member Williams indicated that his interest was in Miscellaneous Revenue, Charges for Services, and Intergovernmental Revenue, as those three line items were significantly over budget. Director Roy reported that when she prepares for the audit, she runs 3,000 pages of general ledger detail to check for any errors and ensure that all revenue is accounted for.

Page 5 of the Tentative Budget was the one-pager, followed by General and Enterprise Fund budgets. The proposed Fee Schedule was on page 31. Proposed fee changes to three cemetery fees and secondary watering fines were highlighted in yellow.

Director Roy reported that the City budgets by Fund through fund accounting, and special revenue funds can only be used for a specific purpose.

Council Member Phillips asked why non-resident Recreation Center membership and usage fees were decreasing. Director Roy reported that Recreation Director, Megan Zollinger, discussed the matter with the City Council in January, and a lot of cleanup was performed at that time. Director Zollinger clarified that the monthly, semi-annual, and annual fee percentages were incorrect and had been standardized. Although some line items may decrease, standardizing the percentages should result in higher revenue.

Council Member Williams asked if the probability of a nonresident purchasing one pass over another would change based on the new calculations. Director Zollinger stated that the intent was to make it advantageous to purchase an annual pass, which requires a one-time, up-front payment. The same logic was applied to resident fees.

In response to a question from Council Member Williams, Director Roy reported that the Animal Control line item is primarily fees paid to North Valley Animal Services. The City has a part-time animal control officer, but animals are taken to the North Valley shelter. Their fee was budgeted at \$100,000 for the current fiscal year, but year-to-date expenses were \$118,000. It is based on the

number of animals brought in and budget needs, and Chief Brown shared with her that the fee will decrease by approximately \$17,000 in FY 2027, so the \$100,000 budget should be adequate. In response to a follow-up question, she clarified that the part-time animal control officer's salary is also included in the line item budget of \$157,000.

Council Member Williams asked about Cook Family Park's impact on the Parks Department budget. Director Roy reported that \$25,000 was being set aside for replacement, and two full-time employees were hired specifically for the park. Administrator Darrington stated that the estimated annual cost is \$200,000 per year.

Council Member Williams asked why the Parks Department was over budget for the current fiscal year. Director Roy reported that it was due to unexpected tree maintenance and removal at the rodeo grounds and parks. Administrator Darrington clarified that those expenses would be moved to the Capital Projects Fund as they are one-time costs. Clean-up of those types of items is done prior to the final Budget Adjustment in June.

Director Roy reported that she had been meeting with department heads to discuss the current-year budget. The Streets budget includes street installation both for developers and the City, and developer reimbursements need to be reconciled. The Engineering Services line item was significantly over budget, but developers are billed for inspection fees. She and City Engineer, Aaron Wilson, were working to reconcile the budget to actual numbers. She and Chief Engemann were also reviewing some line items. Public Works Director, Neal Winterton, expressed concern about the impact of increased fuel prices on vehicle expense lines. Class C Roads and Transportation Utility projects had been approved, and significant savings were realized by sending them to bid early; those budgets needed to be reconciled.

In response to a question from Council Member Rogers, Director Roy reported that the Capital Projects Fund budget can be found on pages 23 and 24 of the budget document and contains capital expenditures that were budgeted for the next fiscal year. Council Member Rogers stated that approximately \$140,000 was still unbudgeted, but \$114,000 had been requested for retention, and the 2025 surplus of \$1 million was proposed to be moved from the General Fund to the Capital Projects Fund. He asked if any money was moved to reserves or if the entire surplus was transferred to one-time capital funds. Director Roy reported that everything is not transferred as the end-of-year General Fund balance was estimated at approximately \$4 million, but no funds would be moved to reserves in FY2026-2027. Administrator Darrington stated that the \$114,000 could be moved to reserves at the Council's direction or retained for use in the next fiscal year.

Council Member Rogers stated that a replacement ambulance would cost \$465,000, and the City was contemplating a tax increase to find \$680,000 for public safety. The City Council may need to discuss whether that capital project should be delayed. He understands that it is one-time money, but revenue was expected to increase. He believed that the Tentative Budget could be adjusted to potentially reduce or eliminate the property tax. It would be adopted at the meeting, but it was not finalized. Administrator Darrington stated that the Final Budget would be adopted on June 22, but the City is required by law to pass a Tentative Budget so the public understands the City's current intentions.

Council Member LeMone remarked that there were only a few meetings until the budget must be adopted, and any adjustments should be made soon. Administrator Darrington asked the Council to

email their recommendations to him or set up a meeting to discuss them. Director Roy stated that she had also made notes on items to review based on Council feedback.

Council Member Rogers expressed concern about not increasing the reserve fund every year and asked if there was a goal reserve contribution for 2027. Director Roy stated that the benchmark for enterprise funds is a balance equaling 180 days of operating expenses. The expected ending General Fund balance of \$4.2 million is the equivalent of 2.5 months of General Fund expenses. The State requires a balance of no less than 5% or more than 35% of budgeted revenue, and at the time of the last audit Pleasant Grove was at approximately 15%. Administrator Darrington stated that the City had never set a reserve contribution goal. If the Council wished to do so for the next budget, that amount could be removed from consideration prior to presenting budgets to departments to discuss capital needs.

Council Member Rogers stated that he did not want to run into a problem of not having the funds to pay the bills or having to dip into reserves unless it is absolutely necessary. The conservative approach to budgeting had allowed the City to see a surplus, but the Council needed to consider whether that approach justified a property tax increase to maintain the same percentage of surplus.

Council Member Williams asked for information on the history of budget underutilization leading to capital expenditures, both in terms of dollars and percentage of the overall budget, over the past five years. Staff had proposed a tax increase, and the City Council needed to consider what would be funded. The Police Department had underutilized its current budget by \$500,000, and he would like to know if they could utilize an additional \$300,000. If not, that money would go to capital expenditures. The question was whether he was comfortable voting for residents to pay more taxes for next year's capital expenditures.

Council Member LeMone stated that she was not comfortable moving forward with a 16.55% increase but may be in favor of a smaller increase like 5%. She asked if cities that do an annual 3% cost-of-living increase are under the same requirements as designating an increase for public safety, for example. Administrator Darrington noted that the Property Tax Impact Statement must clearly state what the money will be used for. If the City Council chooses not to spend it, those items will not be funded. Director Roy stated that in the past, the additional tax revenue would be collected and used as the City sees fit. The new legislative change required an impact statement specifying which lines the revenue will fund. For example, Clearfield's impact statement was several pages because they were allocating money to every department. Council Member LeMone stated that a double-digit increase was too much to ask of residents, and a 3% annual increase would be much more palatable. She believes that the City can use creative ways to find funding without asking for such a large increase.

Mayor Jensen stated that the purpose of the meeting was to begin the process and ask those questions. Administrator Darrington added that the Tentative Budget had been discussed for the past few months. If the Council wanted to pivot from that document, that could be discussed at the next meeting. However, the Property Tax Impact Statement could not be changed prior to adoption of the Tentative Budget. Council Member LeMone expressed concern about presenting a 16.55% tax increase to the public.

In response to a question raised by Council Member Williams, Administrator Darrington clarified that the Council could choose not to move forward, but that would stop the process and no property tax increase could be enacted this year. If the resolutions were approved, the highest percentage increase allowed would be set and discussions would begin. If the Council determined that the increase should be lower, the impact statement could be redone.

Council Member LeMone asked why the statement could be changed in two weeks but not immediately. Administrator Darrington reported that per State requirements, the Property Tax Impact Statement must be read at the meeting, and the statement included very specific numbers that must be disclosed. He noted that the City Council and Staff had discussed the Tentative Budget for two months. Council Member Williams agreed that it had been discussed in theory. However, he had suggested that the City should not go down this path. Council Member LeMone stated that she would prefer the Council stay late and run the numbers. She did not want to present a 16.55% increase to the public, as she believed it would cause outrage and they would lose residents' support.

Mayor Jensen asked Administrator Darrington to clarify the matter. Administrator Darrington reported that by State law, if the City Council voted "no" at the meeting, the City could not do a property tax increase at all. All cities in Utah must decide their upper parameter for a property tax increase at the time they adopt the Tentative Budget. The Tentative Budget with the proposed 16.55% increase was sent to the Council on Wednesday. Council Member LeMone stated that she would not discuss the matter in email as she wanted to do it in public. Mayor Jensen indicated that reviewing the Budget is part of the research required of a Council Member or Mayor, along with asking questions of directors and the City Administrator.

Council Member Phillips remarked that voting "no" would prevent a public conversation, but saying "yes" would allow that conversation.

Council Member Williams expressed concern that approving the Tentative Budget with a proposed tax increase would send the message that the City Council has approved a tentative tax increase, and he did not want his name attached to that message. He appreciates Staff and the way they handled the budget process, but he did not like the forced hand of requiring "this" so "that" can be preserved. That was not an issue with Staff, but with the state, as it is their rule. He did not want to be misrepresented as being unsupportive of the Police, Fire, or how the City is administered. However, he believes that the process should be changed. In retrospect, he would have funded Police and Fire first.

Mayor Jensen stated that the City Council tried that approach. They went line by line and presented the budget to citizens, who indicated that they did not want to cut library or recreation programs.

Council Member Williams reiterated that he would like to fund Police and Fire first, in addition to holding 20% for potential capital rollover. He would like to see a more practiced approach, as it seemed like some line items needed additional attention. He was not in support of a tax increase as he believed the money could be found.

Council Member Phillips stated that he was firmly in favor of a motion that allowed the City Council to have a conversation to determine whether it is appropriate to enact a tax increase or not. The Council would not be approving a tax increase but simply opening the door to discussion, and he

believed that it was worthy of discussion. He heard Council Member LeMone asking for a compromise and Council Member Williams expressing firm support of public safety that could potentially be funded through other avenues. Voting in favor of the item would allow the City Council to have that conversation. He believed that the public would appreciate the varied discussion, challenging questions, and nitpicking of budget line items to determine whether a tax increase was the right decision. If it was what is best for the City and the services it provides, he hoped that the City Council would have the strength to follow through with it even if their neighbors are upset. If the money could be found in other, fiscally responsible ways or in phases that allow a smaller increase, that would be great, but the Council could not reach that conclusion without an affirmative vote to consider it.

In response to a question raised by Council Member LeMone, Administrator Darrington confirmed that no materials would be sent to the public prior to the next meeting unless the Council directed him to do so. Council Member LeMone asked when the August 11 Truth-in-Taxation hearing would be noticed and when the City Council must decide on the final proposed tax increase. Administrator Darrington reported that the rate must be finalized by June 22, and the public hearing would be held on August 11.

Council Member Phillips remarked that the City could conduct open houses, include notices in billing statements, etc. Administrator Darrington stated that the information would be rolled out when the City Council indicates that they are comfortable with the final numbers. Council Member Williams expressed concern that only a fraction of residents would show up to meetings.

Council Member Rogers stated that he would like to conduct an independent, third-party survey that is held to defensible and recognizable standards as that will give the Council a true idea of citizens' opinions. He was voted into office in the same year that the last proposed tax increase failed, and he was surprised at the reasons given in both support and opposition. The City has a wide variety of voters, some of whom are much more engaged and vocal than others. An open house would attract that sector of the population, but an independent survey conducted by a reputable company and designed to solicit unbiased information would be more valuable. The Council wants to represent residents of the Pleasant Grove and ensure that the City provides a level of services that keeps the community safe, beautiful, and a wonderful place to live. He agreed with Council Member LeMone that the requested percentage was too high, but he also agreed with Council Member Phillips that the State passed the law so that the City can engage with the public earlier in the process. He wanted public input because he believes that a large percentage of residents want extra speed enforcement, for example.

Council Member LeMone agreed that an independent survey would reach more people than an open house. She was open to continuing the discussion, but she did not want to begin distributing materials with a 16.55% increase if that was not the final number. She wanted to discuss the matter in a meeting, not via email.

ACTION: Council Member Phillips moved to APPROVE Resolution 2026-21 – Adopting a Tentative Budget for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2027, with a Property Tax Increase, and providing an Effective Date. Council Member Rogers seconded the motion. The motion carried by a vote of 3-to-1, with Council Members Rogers, Phillips, and LeMone voting “Yes” and Council Member Williams voting “No”.

B. To Consider Resolution 2026-22 Presenting a Property Tax Impact Statement for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2027, and Providing an Effective Date. *Presenter: Director Roy.*

Director Roy read the following statement into the record:

**Proposed Property Tax Impact Schedule
Tentative Budget July 1, 2026, to June 30, 2027**

Pleasant Grove City will consider an increase to its property tax rates from .0009620 to .001121 (estimated) to generate an additional \$683,088. The following information is intended to provide decisionmakers and the public with an explanation of how the City's operations would be affected if the property tax rate remains the same.

Pleasant Grove City's Current Property Tax Rate	0.000962
Pleasant Grove City's Current Property Tax Revenue	\$4,127,422
Proposed Revenue with Tax Change	\$4,810,510
New Property Tax Revenue to Pleasant Grove City	\$683,088
Estimated Increase to Pleasant Grove City's Property Tax Rate	16.55%
Estimated Increase to a Resident's Combined Rate*	1.90%
Estimated Increase to a primary residence of \$570,655	\$49.97
Estimated Increase to a commercial valued at \$570,655	\$90.85

Affected Department: Police

- **Proposed Budget:** \$6,654,468
- **Budget without Tax Change:** \$6,289,380
- **Budget Change:** (\$365,088)
- **Impact of No Tax Increase** - The Police Department will not hire two new police officer, and provide no funding for reserve or retention.

Affected Department: Fire

- **Proposed Budget:** \$3,722,747
- **Budget without Tax Change:** \$3,404,747
- **Budget Change:** (\$318,000)
- **Impact of No Tax Increase** - The Fire Department will not hire three new firefighters or provide funding for outfitting.

* Property tax rate when all taxing entities are included (School district, Utah County, etc.)

In response to a question raised by Council Member LeMone, Administrator Darrington reported that approval of the resolution would temporarily set the highest potential property tax rate.

ACTION: Council Member Rogers moved to APPROVE Resolution 2026-22 – Presenting a Property Tax Impact Statement for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2027, and providing an Effective Date. Council Member Phillips seconded the motion. The motion carried by a vote of 3-to-1, with Council Members Rogers, Phillips, and LeMone voting “Yes” and Council Member Williams voting “No”.

C. To Consider Resolution (2026-23) Acknowledging Compliance with Truth-in-Taxation Notice and Disclosure Requirements Related to the FY2026-2027 Tentative Budget. *Presenter: Director Roy.*

Director Roy read the Resolution as required by Utah Code § 59-2-919:

**RESOLUTION NO. 2026-023
PLEASANT GROVE CITY, UTAH**

A RESOLUTION ACKNOWLEDGING COMPLIANCE WITH TRUTH-IN-TAXATION NOTICE AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO THE FY2026-2027 TENTATIVE BUDGET

WHEREAS, Utah Code §59-2-919 and §59-2-924 require specific notice, disclosure, and presentation actions when a tentative budget includes a proposed property tax rate increase; and

WHEREAS, a separate item was included on the agenda for the public meeting of the City Council held on May 5, 2026, notifying the public that the Budget Officer intended to state to the City Council that the tentative budget for Fiscal Year 2026–2027 includes a proposed property tax rate increase; and

WHEREAS, at the public meeting held on May 5, 2026, the Budget Officer made a statement to the City Council that the tentative budget for Fiscal Year 2026–2027 includes a proposed property tax rate increase; and

WHEREAS, at the same public meeting and as a separate agenda item, the Budget Officer presented to the City Council a Property Tax Impact Schedule, prepared and presented separately from other budget documents, as defined in Utah Code § 59-2-924, and the City Council duly considered and adopted the Property Tax Impact Schedule.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF PLEASANT GROVE CITY, STATE OF UTAH, as follows:

Section 1. The City Council hereby acknowledges that the required notice and disclosure actions related to the proposed property tax rate increase included in the

Fiscal Year 2026–2027 tentative budget have been carried out in accordance with Utah Code §§ 59-2-919 and 59-2-924.

Section 2. The City Council hereby directs that the Property Tax Impact Schedule shall:

- Be made available for public inspection in the office of the City Recorder and on the City’s official website; and
- Be included as a separate item on the agenda at each public meeting or public hearing held prior to June 30, 2026, at which the City Council discusses the proposed General Fund budget for Fiscal Year 2026–2027.

Section 3. The City Council hereby directs the Budget Officer, or designee, to transmit the required notice to the Utah State Tax Commission and the Utah County Auditor on or before June 1, 2026, indicating that the City is considering a property tax rate increase and that the City Council will hold a public hearing on the proposed property tax rate increase on August 11, 2026, at 6:00 p.m., at the Pleasant Grove City Community Room, in compliance with Utah Code § 59-2-919.

ACTION: Council Member Phillips moved to APPROVE Resolution 2026-23 – Acknowledging Compliance with Truth-in-Taxation Notice and Disclosure Requirements Related to the FY2026-2027 Tentative Budget. Council Member Rogers seconded the motion. The motion carried by a vote of 3-to-1 with Council Members Rogers, Phillips, and LeMone voting “Yes” and Council Member Williams voting “No”.

D. To Consider Resolution (2026-24) Stating the City Council’s intent to Consider a Tax Rate that Exceeds the Certified Tax Rate for the Property Tax and Establishing a Truth-in-Taxation Public Hearing. *Presenter: Director Roy.*

**RESOLUTION NO. 2026-024
PLEASANT GROVE CITY, UTAH**

A RESOLUTION STATING THE CITY COUNCIL’S INTENT TO CONSIDER A TAX RATE THAT EXCEEDS THE CERTIFIED TAX RATE FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY PROPERTY TAX AND ESTABLISHING A TRUTH-IN-TAXATION PUBLIC HEARING

WHEREAS, Utah Code § 59-2-919 requires specific notice and disclosure when a taxing entity intends to consider a tax rate that exceeds the certified tax rate; and **WHEREAS**, the City Council of Pleasant Grove City, State of Utah, is considering adopting a public safety property tax rate for Fiscal Year 2026–2027 that exceeds the certified tax rate; and

WHEREAS, the proposed public safety tax rate increase is estimated to generate approximately \$683,088 in additional ad valorem tax revenue; and

WHEREAS, the sole purpose of the additional ad valorem tax revenue is to increase levels of service, related to the City’s public safety; and

WHEREAS, the proposed tax rate increase represents an approximate 15.9% increase in ad valorem tax revenue based on the proposed tax rate.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF PLEASANT GROVE CITY, STATE OF UTAH, as follows:

Section 1. The City Council hereby states its intent to consider adopting a property tax rate for Fiscal Year 2026–2027 that exceeds the certified tax rate, consistent with the requirements of Utah Code § 59-2-919.

Section 2. The City Council hereby establishes a public hearing on the proposed property tax rate increase to be held on August 11, 2026, at 6:00 p.m., at Pleasant Grove City Community Room, at which members of the public will have an opportunity to provide comment regarding the proposed increase, as required by Utah Code § 59-2-919.

Section 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ACTION: Council Member Rogers moved to APPROVE Resolution 2026-24 – Stating the City Council’s Intent to Consider a Tax Rate that Exceeds the Certified Tax Rate for the Property Tax and Establishing a Truth-in-Taxation Public Hearing. Council Member Phillips seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Phillips, Rogers, Williams, and LeMone voting Yes.

ACTION: At 8:23 p.m., Council Member Phillips moved to ADJOURN the City Council Meeting and Convene as the RDA. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Rogers, Phillips, LeMone, and Williams voting “Yes.”

The City Council Meeting reconvened at 8:32 p.m.

11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

A. Continued Items from the Work Session, if needed.

Administrator Darrington reported that when the budget was discussed on May 19, the Property Tax Impact Statement must be read into the record again. As there was no consensus on the final numbers, the original statement would be read. In response to a question, he reported that the document could not be changed until the City Council reconvened on May 19. Council Member Rogers requested that Staff provide a table showing how a 10%, 8%, 5%, or 3% property tax increase would affect the budget. Council Member LeMone stated that she would like to reach a consensus prior to reading the statement so it could reflect the accurate percentage.

Administrator Darrington reiterated that by State law, if the City Council discusses the budget, the Property Tax Impact Statement must be read.

Council Member Phillips noted that the Tentative Budget contains estimates, as the final valuation and tax rate is not provided until June. Administrator Darrington suggested that the Council could

delay discussing the budget until the June 2 meeting, after the survey was completed and the final Certified Tax Rate had been received. He was confident that the number could be decreased.

Council Member Rogers stated that the potential 16.55% tax increase was now public, and not everyone would listen to the meeting or read the minutes. If the Council waited until June 2, public opinion could preclude any tax increase. Regardless, it would be harder to change the narrative. The full City Council was in support of the budget and finding ways to cover the deficit, but it was unlikely that a larger increase would pass or even be needed. He would rather have something to read in two weeks that may need to be changed again. He did not want citizens to have the inaccurate perception that a 16.55% tax increase was pending because the majority of the Council was opposed to such a large increase.

Council Member Williams stated that he employed four people to review the proposed FY2027 Tentative Budget against FY2026 and FY2025 actuals, and he believed that the money was available. He ran on economic development, but the Tentative Budget had the same old tax increases. He did not believe that was how residents want the government to run, as he believes they want it to run on economic development through property tax and increment sales tax.

Administrator Darrington appreciated the Council's comments and indicated that he was reporting on State requirements. At the Council's direction, Staff would prepare options for 10%, 8%, 5%, and 3% increases for their review. Council Member LeMone stated that she did not want to conduct a survey prior to a Council decision on the actual percentage. After further discussion, it was decided that a decision on the survey would be made after more data is available.

Administrator Darrington stated that he did not care for the restrictions that state law placed on the Council. It made no sense to read a statement every time the budget was discussed when they knew the numbers would change, but the process had to follow the law. He heard that the Council wanted Staff to review alternatives and look for other opportunities for savings. He would present the five options requested by the Council, but there would be a funding gap with all options.

Council Member Phillips remarked that, to Council Member Williams' point, there may be opportunities to divert or reclassify line items to fund the full request without a large tax increase. Council Member Williams stated that the library pavilion was a good example. Council Member Rogers agreed and asked if other items could be paid through CARES Act funds. As mentioned during the Open Session, perhaps the City should first fully fund Police and Fire and then be honest about how that would affect other departments. Administrator Darrington stated that in order to fund public safety first, he would need the Council's input on which departments should be cut. Council Member Williams clarified that the request was to collectively look at the City's expenses. He was surprised at what his employees found in the budget, and their findings were why he had to vote "no".

Council Member Rogers stated that the difficulty in maintaining full public safety staffing due to the competitive nature of the job market may mean that the full budget was not needed upfront. Turnover and open positions had created a \$500,000 surplus in the Police. If they were considering a property tax increase, the budget needed to be scrutinized, and he voted "yes" so that the Council and Staff could continue to do so. If a certain level of property tax increase was necessary to fully staff public safety and retain the City's amazing library and recreation offerings, he was willing to consider it.

Council Member Williams stated that in private business, he does not fully fund new positions at the beginning of the year; he asks for the ramp schedule and budgets accordingly. The City's Tentative Budget would fully fund the positions as of July 1, but they would not be filled that quickly. He believes those types of realities can be worked through to fund the deficit and that the threat of cutting library or recreation funding is a scare tactic.

Administrator Darrington clarified that it was not his intention to scare anyone but rather to gain an understanding of the Council's position. He understood each Council Member's concerns, and Staff would now try to find a way to make their ideas work with the budget. They would then provide options for the Council's consideration. Staff proposed a 16.55% or \$4 per month increase, and they understood that \$4 per month would impact different people in different ways. As a City Administrator, what made the most sense was to fully fund the deficit with property taxes so the expenses are funded in perpetuity. However, he would bring different options back to the City Council.

12) REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE MAY 19, 2026, CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

Administrator Darrington reported that the St. John Properties flex space will be on the agenda. The Renaissance project was still date uncertain.

Staff reports were heard next.

Recreation Director, Megan Zollinger, reported that the Berserker Blitz would be on Saturday, May 30 at 11:00 a.m. at Cook Family Park. Gabbi Usevich's last day of employment was May 1; she would be working in Alaska for the summer and then moving to Europe. She was reviewing departmental needs to determine if positions could be restructured rather than hiring a full-time replacement.

Parks Director, Deon Giles, reported that the Chamber of Commerce helped clean the Discovery Park playground. Trail Day was held the previous Saturday, and 172 volunteers cleaned almost every mile of trail. They also had a planting day with the old Test Out group. On Tuesday, April 28, a vehicle drove through the Cook Family Park soccer field and cemetery addition and caused approximately \$1,000 in damage. The culprit had been identified and contacted.

In response to a question from Council Member LeMone, Director Giles reported that he asked the County to install gates throughout the City's canal section. Gates are closed when performing maintenance and in emergencies. When the gates were originally installed, they were only opened during snowplowing. They were used so frequently that the County began leaving them open.

Fire Chief, Drew Engemann, reported that there would be a ceremony on May 6 at 5:00 p.m. to recognize the three employees who had graduated from paramedic school and the one firefighter who had completed his one-year probationary period. Two new recruits will be graduating on Thursday, May 7 at 5:00 p.m. at Fox Hollow. One firefighter would graduate from the heavy rescue class on May 15 in Lehi. There would also be a demonstration.

Human Resources Manager, David Packard, reported that open enrollment would begin on May 11, and employees would have two weeks to make benefits selections to take effect July 1. It was the fourth consecutive year without an increase in medical insurance rates. Public Service Recognition Week was May 3 through May 9, and he thanked everyone who attended the recognition event.

13) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS

Council Member LeMone reported that the Miss Pleasant Grove Pageant would be held on Saturday, May 16. The boys' soccer team played its last game and ended the season 16-0, undefeated for the first time in the team's history.

Council Member Phillips expressed his appreciation for the budget conservation. It may feel tense at times, but he appreciated Director Roy, Administrator Darrington, and department heads for their professionalism, efforts, and due diligence.

Council Member Rogers agreed with Council Member Phillips. He hoped that Director Roy, Administrator Darrington, and Directors recognized that the City Council understands that the City receives so many accolades because its Staff does an excellent job. It is necessary to have robust budget discussions because that is what the public deserves, but he knows that the City did not become a Triple Crown Award winner or maintain \$4 million in reserves by accident. His desire to find alternate ways to fund departments did not reflect a lack of faith in Staff. He appreciates the willingness of all City departments to absorb a lot of the frustrations that may be unfairly placed on their departments.

Council Member Williams echoed his colleagues' sentiments. He thinks about revenue and expenses all day. He is in charge of four budgets and understands that the process is difficult. The ability to ask questions did not reflect a lack of support or confidence in City Staff, but is just the role of the City Council. When it affects a widow on a fixed budget, he has to ask the hard questions. If there had not been such high utility increases in addition to a potential school district issue, neither of which the Council voted on, but both of which will impact the widow, he would have been in favor of the tax increase.

Mayor Jensen thanked the Council and Staff for the discussion and Administrator Darrington and Director Roy for their institutional knowledge and experience, as he appreciated being able to rely on their expertise.

14) SIGNING OF PLATS

No plats were signed.

15) REVIEW CALENDAR

Administrator Darrington reported that a joint meeting with the school board would be held on May 13.

16) **ADJOURN**

ACTION: At 9:06 p.m., Council Member Williams moved to ADJOURN the City Council Meeting. Council Member Rogers seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Rogers, Phillips, LeMone, and Williams voting “Yes.”

The City Council Meeting Minutes of May 5, 2026, were approved by the City Council on June 22, 2026.



Wendy Thorpe, CMC
City Recorder

(Exhibits are in the City Council Minutes binders in the Recorder’s office.)